DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 274 FL 009 783

AUTHOR Politzer, Robert L.
TITLE Some Reflections on the Role of Linguistics in the Preparation of Bilingual/ Cross-Cultural Teachers. Bilingual Education Paper Series, Vol. 1, No. 12.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Los Angeles. National Dissemination and Assessment Center.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 19p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Dissemination and Assessment Center, 5151 State University Drive, King Hall C2094A, Los Angeles, California 90032 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; Applied Linguistics; Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Cognitive Objectives; *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Context; Cultural Education; Cultural Pluralism; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Language Attitudes; Language Instruction; Language Tests; Language Variation; *Linguistics; Program Content; Psycholinguistics; *Sociolinguistics; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII

ABSTRACT

During the past twenty years, the field of linguistics has changed in ways that are significant for the preparation of bilingual/cross-cultural teachers. Most linguists today would agree that variability in language and the relation of language to societal phenomena are now major concerns of linguistic inquiry and that interdisciplinary branches of linguistics, especially sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, are assuming increasing importance in linguistic inquiry. The importance of the contribution of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics to the training of bilingual education specialists must be judged according to the utilization and role of these sciences in the total professional preparation. Knowledge of them must be matched with cultural understanding and a knowledge of teaching methodology and the language of the target group. Because teachers' attitudes seem to influence educational outcomes, the impact of a linguistics course on language attitudes suggests that the linguistics course must be taught not only from the cognitive but also from the affective point of view. A summary of the findings of a test battery being developed by the Program for Teaching and Linguistic Pluralism of the Center for Educational Research at Stanford concludes this paper. It reinforces the view that a knowledge of linguistics cannot be successfully applied without a knowledge of the pupils' dominant language or without cultural understanding and empathy. (AMH)

ED161274

Bilingual Education
PAPER SERIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NDAC - LA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

FL009783

National Dissemination
and Assessment Center
California State University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA. 90032

Vol. 1 No. 12
July 1978

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ROLE OF LINGUISTICS IN THE PREPARATION OF BILINGUAL/ CROSS-CULTURAL TEACHERS

Robert L. Politzer
Director
Program on Teaching and
Linguistic Pluralism
Stanford, California

FL009783

The subject of this publication was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education; no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

This publication was printed with funds provided by the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by Public Law 93.380.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ROLE OF LINGUISTICS IN THE PREPARATION OF BILINGUAL/CROSS-CULTURAL TEACHERS

Robert L. Politzer

REQUIREMENTS FOR BILINGUAL/CROSS-CULTURAL TEACHERS

There appears to be some agreement concerning the overall patterns that the professional preparation of bilingual/cross-cultural specialists should take. For example, guidelines for the preparation of bilingual/bicultural teachers developed at a conference held in 1974 at the Center for Applied Linguistics (1974) divided the training of bilingual/bicultural teachers into eight categories: (I) Language Proficiency, (II) Linguistics, (III) Culture, (IV) Instructional Methods, (V) Curriculum Utilization, (VI) Assessment, (VII) School Community Relations, and (VIII) Supervised Teaching. State requirements for the certification of bilingual/bicultural teachers generally follow the pattern suggested by the Center for Applied Linguistics. For instance, the recommendations for the structure of bilingual/cross-cultural specialist programs issued by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing of the State of California also call for supervised practical teaching experience and involvement in the communities to be served and divide the core of professional preparation into three areas: Culture, Teaching Techniques, and Linguistic Competency (Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, sections 1-1.1, 1-1.2, 1-1.3, 1973). Sections IV, V, and VI of the recommendations made by the Center for Applied Linguistics (Instructional Methods, Curriculum Utilization, and

Assessment) are subsumed under the area of Teaching Competencies. The linguistics requirements spelled out by the California Commission include both Section I (Language Proficiency) and Section II (Linguistics) of the guidelines developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics.

CULTURE, TEACHING TECHNIQUES, AND LINGUISTIC COMPETENCY, 1958-1978

The tripartite division of professional competence, Culture, Teaching Techniques, and Linguistic Competency, is reminiscent of the recommendations made for the training or retraining of foreign language teachers under the auspices of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. These recommendations were clearly reflected in the test batteries that were constructed and used for the purpose of evaluating the training of foreign language teachers undertaken in NDEA institutes. These batteries (Guidelines, 1966) included a test in Civilization and Culture and a series of tests covering Linguistics, defined as Knowledge of the Language (tests in listening, speaking, reading, and writing), as well as knowledge about language as applied to teaching methods (Applied Linguistics Test). The similarity between the overall structure of the 1958 foreign language teacher training effort and the requirements set for the training of bilingual/cross-cultural specialists is probably more than purely coincidental, and it may be due to the direct influence of the foreign language teacher training programs on the bilingual/cross-cultural specialist recommendations. After all, many of the individuals who are now involved with bilingual education were or are still involved in the education of foreign language teachers.

Whatever the reasons for the similarity between the NDEA foreign language teacher training programs and present bilingual/cross-

cultural specialist programs, we should not allow these similarities to mislead us into assuming that the training of bilingual/cross-cultural specialists should very strongly reflect the training of foreign language teachers and especially the training of foreign language teachers as practiced in 1958.

Differences between a desirable program for training bilingual/cross-cultural specialists in 1978 and programs for training foreign language teachers in 1958 must be responsive to two major factors:

1. Differences between the purposes of bilingual education and teaching languages other than English to native speakers of English.
2. Changes in the state of knowledge that have taken place between 1958 and 1978.

In this article I shall address myself primarily to the latter of these factors.

LINGUISTICS 1958 VS. LINGUISTICS 1978

The linguistics tests of the Modern Language Association (MLA) battery deal with pronunciation, phonetics, orthography, morphology and syntax, general linguistics, and historical and comparative philology. "...[T]he general emphasis in each test is on those differences between English and the foreign language which are of importance in teaching" (Guidelines, 1966, p. 397). In other words, the tests concentrate on language structure, contrastive analysis, and the elaboration of interference phenomena.

The tests also put emphasis on the ability to identify elements of language structure on the basis of their substitutability in sentence patterns, an activity that found its pedagogical counterpart

in the substitution drill, one of the mainstays of the audiolingual method. The emphasis on the contrastive analysis and linguistic discovery procedure found in the Applied Linguistics Tests, then, complements rather well the general orientation of the professional preparation test that stresses "...knowledge of teaching methods that are common to different foreign languages (with emphasis on the audio-lingual approach)" (Guidelines, 1966, p. 397).

The Applied Linguistic Tests and their relationship to the rest of the test battery thus reflect, as one might expect, the state of the art and the concerns of 1958. Structuralism and the assumption of the importance of contrastive analysis dominate the Applied Linguistics Tests. However, perhaps even more important for the 1958/1978 contrast are some of the aspects of linguistics and their relationship to language teaching that are not included in the MLA test batteries; the language proficiency tests included in the MLA tests deal only with one speech variety (a standard language) and ignore the possibility of variations. Knowledge of culture--while stressed as an important aspect of language teacher preparation--is conceived as being quite separate from language. In fact, the stated intention of the culture test is to "...measure the knowledge of civilization and culture (as distinct from knowledge of the language) needed by a teacher to introduce...students intelligently to that area of the world in which the language is spoken" (Guidelines, 1966, p. 397). The role of linguistics within the MLA test battery and within the training offered by the NDEA institutes thus not only reflected linguistic structuralism and audiolingualism but also expressed the attitude that the primary concern of linguistics is the description of a relatively homogenous speech community and

that language is an independent phenomenon that can be studied in isolation from pragmatics or social contexts.

It is, of course, difficult to compare the linguistics of 1958 with that of 1978 in a few sweeping generalizations. Nevertheless, I believe that most linguists would agree with the following statements: (1) the study of variability in language is one of the major concerns of linguistic inquiry today; (2) as shown by the emergence of such journals as *Language in Society* and the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, the relation of the study of language to societal phenomena (sociolinguistics) has become a major, perhaps the most important, concern of linguistic inquiry; (3) many linguists no longer feel that it is important to think of linguistics as an independent discipline, and several branches of linguistics--especially sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics--are assuming increasing importance in linguistic inquiry.

LINGUISTICS 1978 AND THE PREPARATION OF BILINGUAL SPECIALISTS

The role of linguistics in the preparation of bilingual specialists must reflect the linguistics of 1978 rather than that of 1958. It must recognize that like linguistics, "Applied linguistics is dynamic, not static" and that "applied linguistics redefines itself afresh for each task" (Strevens, 1977, pp. 39-40). Thus, the applied linguistics of 1978 cannot stop at teaching interference phenomena or be satisfied with teaching some principles of linguistic analysis. More important than the ability to identify phonemes and allophones or to account for syntactical phenomena by tree diagrams or arrows pointing from left to right is an acquaintance with some of the problems dealt with and some of the insights gained by psycho-

linguists and sociolinguists. And just as the linguistics of 1978 is not an isolated discipline, so the contribution of the linguistics of 1978 to the training of bilingual education specialists must be judged according to its utilization and its role in the total professional preparation.

As a clarification of the above point, the linguistics and psycholinguistics of today cannot be used for the prescription of an infallible method of teaching English or Spanish as a second language. But there is a vast and growing literature of psycholinguistic research that tells us how and why children learn first and second languages (e.g., Brown, 1973, for first-language acquisition; Hatch, 1978, for second-language acquisition) or what the role of errors in second-language acquisition might be (Richards, 1974). There is theory as well as research evidence (Ramírez and Stromquist, 1978) that children do not learn languages by repetitious pattern practice but by using language in meaningful contexts. These types of insight should be available to the bilingual specialist who must decide what kind of experiences should be utilized to achieve language proficiency.

The importance of the role that sociolinguistics must play in the preparation of the bilingual specialist is even more obvious. The target populations of the bilingual education effort tend to be characterized by extreme variability of language use and often by relatively little use and knowledge of standard language forms. How and to what extent nonstandardized forms of language should be used in instruction is debatable. What seems to be beyond debate, however, is that the teacher of a bilingual program should know the linguistic background of the children in the program and should be

able to assess their true language abilities. The bilingual teacher must therefore understand such phenomena as code switching, use of linguistic registers, and use of different language in different domains of life. To understand the cultural background of the child, the bilingual specialist must know not only what the home language of the child is but also how language is used in the family and the community, the rules for taking turns, and the rules for when to speak and when to be silent.

Therefore, in the preparation of the bilingual/cross-cultural specialist, linguistics cannot be thought of as a well-defined subject area making up a third or fourth of the curriculum, sharply delineated against areas like culture or teaching method. A knowledge of linguistics becomes part of every lesson, every test, and every contact established with the family and community.

LINGUISTIC FACTS VS. LINGUISTIC CONCEPTS AND ATTITUDES

The stipulation that bilingual teachers should know the socio- and psycholinguistic dimensions of the speech and speech community of their pupils leads to some reflection on the meaning of *know*. Bilingual teachers who come from the same speech community will *know* the sociolinguistic rules of the community in the sense that they can apply them correctly. If they do not come from the community, they may never learn to use these rules themselves nor will it be necessary--nor desirable--that they do so. Many rules of language use serve as intra-ethnic identity markers and their use by "outsiders" is often inappropriate. Bilingual teachers who are not member of the target community can *know* the sociolinguistic rules of that community primarily in the sense of *knowing about* rather than in the sense of

knowing for their own personal use.

The latter type of knowledge (knowing about) is valuable, but it must be approached with a great deal of caution. Whenever we specify that outsiders should become acquainted with the cultural or linguistic behavior of a specific group, we must be careful that the knowledge to be acquired will not take the form of generalizations, e.g., Mexican-Americans code switch from English and Spanish. Such generalizations are almost invariably false, if for no other reason than they do not take into account the great deal of variability that exists within any group. Ultimately, these generalizations tend to bring about the very phenomenon that the linguistic and cultural instruction is designed to counteract in the first place--stereotyping.

Linguistic and cultural stereotypes can be avoided by approaching the teaching of the sociolinguistic rules characterizing a given group with a general comparative framework, e.g., code switching is not a strange phenomenon characteristic of Mexican-Americans but is used by *some* Mexican-Americans under certain specific conditions just as it is used by other bilingual populations all over the world under similar conditions. It fills some very specific denotative and expressive needs--needs that are universal--and some that may be fulfilled by monolingual speakers through other means such as a switch in language register.

In a recent publication, Dr. John Lum (1977) presented the point of view that "culture is usually more effectively learned on the affective level than on the cognitive level" (p. 11). Linguistics is inextricably linked to culture, and the affective aspects and outcomes of the teaching of linguistics must indeed be carefully

weighed. A linguistics course that focuses on the conveying of facts about a target population and that leaves the prospective bilingual teacher with the notion that the children of a specific community have some peculiar and strange speech habits that are different from those of other people could be quite counter-productive (even if upon completion of the course the student may be able to enumerate five rules for code switching and ten *pachuquismos*).

That teachers' attitudes influence educational outcomes is a widely held and widely researched assumption (e.g., Dusek, 1975). There is also evidence that teachers do hypothesize about educational outcomes on the basis of their pupils' speech and that the teachers' hypotheses can become self-fulfilling prophecies; e.g., in a study recently conducted at Stanford (Ramírez and Politzer, 1976), it was found that teachers who made low estimates of the achievement potential of bilingual code-switching pupils also gave those pupils lower grades than other teachers and that even the achievement of the bilingual pupils as measured by objective tests seemed to be affected by the teachers' attitude toward the pupils' language. The impact of a linguistics course on language attitude is, therefore, very important. To teach a linguistics course successfully not only from the cognitive but also from the affective point of view represents a real challenge. We lack specific information as to exactly how such a course should be taught. We can only surmise that in addition to such intangibles as the personality of the course instructor, techniques similar to those suggested for the creation of cross-cultural awareness (e.g., awareness of universal principles and their application in one's own culture), contact with people rather than books will affect the outcome (Lum, 1977).

REFLECTION ON SOME RESEARCH FINDINGS: THE TEST FOR BILINGUAL TEACHERS OF THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AT STANFORD

Since the above-mentioned MLA tests reflect neither present-day linguistics nor the requirements of bilingual education, the Program for Teaching and Linguistic Pluralism of the Center for Educational Research at Stanford undertook the construction of a test battery dealing with the linguistic aspects of the professional preparation of bilingual/cross-cultural teachers. A group of experts was asked to construct the tests, which in turn were submitted to and discussed by a working conference of educators assembled at the Stanford Center in February, 1976. The topics covered by the tests and the chief authors of each test are:

Proficiency in Spanish	Dr. Bárbara J. Merino
ESL: English as a Second Language	Dr. Arnulfo G. Ramírez
SSL: Spanish as a Second Language	Dr. Gustavo Gonzáles
Spanish of the Southwest	Dr. Rosaura Sanchez
Teaching Reading in Spanish	Dr. Ricardo Cornejo Dr. Eleanor Thonis Mr. Edgardo Arce-Torres

Descriptions of the tests, which are still in the process of being edited and elaborated upon, can be found in the report of the 1976 conference at the Stanford Center (Merino, 1976) and in publications dealing with preliminary results of the administration of the tests (Merino and Politzer, 1977). Brief summaries of the general content of the test battery follow. The Proficiency test in Spanish not only deals with general proficiency but also inquiries into the teacher's ability to deal in Spanish with specific curric-

ulum areas such as math, language arts, and art. The English and Spanish as a Second Language tests primarily probe the teacher's ability to diagnose (knowledge of error analysis) and to explain language rules. The Spanish of the Southwest test is an instrument that measures knowledge of Mexican-American (nonstandard) Spanish. The Teaching Reading in Spanish test probes the teacher's acquaintance with concepts of sound/symbol correspondence and different methods used in teaching reading. The test battery also includes instruments designed to measure attitudes toward different types of teaching methodology and toward the use of Mexican-American Spanish.

During the past two years research has been conducted to establish the reliability and validity of the tests, which in terms of pupil achievement led to some rather interesting and perhaps somewhat unexpected results. In a study undertaken during the academic year 1976-77 (Merino and Politzer, 1977), some of the tests were administered at the beginning of the year to 147 teachers and teacher aids in two major bilingual education programs in California. General achievement of children in the program was measured by relative gains made on objective tests such as the *Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills* and the *Spanish/English Balance Tests* developed by the Stanford Center. The criterion measures used were probably not ideally suited to evaluate progress in bilingual education. Perhaps we should not have expected strong validation of the tests through our research. However, the somewhat surprising result of the investigation was that there were strong indications of significant *negative* relationships between teacher test scores and pupil achievement on such tests as English as a Second Language, Spanish as a

Second Language, and Teaching Reading in Spanish. The only test of the battery for which teacher scores showed a significant positive relationship to pupil achievement was the Proficiency in Spanish test.

In the following year, 1977-78, the Program on Teaching and Linguistic Pluralism undertook research efforts that dealt specifically with teaching reading in Spanish and teaching English as a Second Language in the context of bilingual education. The research involved, among other steps, the administration of the Teaching Reading in Spanish test and English as a Second Language test (in separate experiments) to teachers and their validation against specific pupil achievement criterion measures in English and Reading in Spanish. The Spanish reading experiment furnished results similar to the ones obtained the previous year. Among the teacher characteristics studied in the experiment, knowledge of Spanish rather than achievement on the Teaching Reading in Spanish test related to pupil achievement (Ramírez, 1978). The English as a Second Language experiment, on the other hand, did furnish positive validation of the Teaching English as a Second Language test. Pupil achievement as measured in English production as well as comprehension tests correlated positively and significantly with teacher performance on the English as a Second Language test (Ramírez and Stromquist, 1978).

What can explain the rather inconsistent results and especially the negative correlations of teacher scores with pupil achievement? We can hardly assume that the experts and the conference responsible for the production of tests were so far off target that they devised tests identifying teachers who have adverse effects on bilingual pupils. Moreover, at least one of the tests--English as a Second

Language--*did* predict pupil achievement in the second round of experiments. The negative correlation between teacher performance and pupil achievement on some of the tests can probably be explained as follows: within the teacher groups in which the negative correlations were obtained, the teachers who tended to do well in the applied linguistics test and the teachers who had had preparation in linguistics and applied linguistics were, by and large, not those who came from the pupils' speech community and who had high proficiency in Spanish. The reading in Spanish experiment (that also involved the study of successful teaching behaviors) made it quite clear that a thorough proficiency in the kind of Spanish required to teach reading at the elementary school level is the basic prerequisite for the teachers' success. In a similar way, an inspection of the data involved in the first-year study showed that in general the teachers who did well in the English and Spanish as a Second Language tests and the Teaching Reading in Spanish test tended to come from a group that had relatively lower Spanish proficiency and/or no direct roots in the Latino community. These research findings do not imply that linguistics and applied linguistics should not be part of the training of the bilingual specialist. They do, however, reinforce the view that linguistics is only part of the total preparation of the bilingual/cross-cultural specialist. A knowledge of linguistics cannot be successfully applied without a knowledge of the pupils' dominant language or without cultural understanding and empathy.

The views presented in this article can best be summarized by stating that the part that a knowledge of linguistics plays in the preparation of the bilingual educator is important, but the word

bilingual should not mislead us into assuming that a knowledge of linguistics *per se* is sufficient or overwhelmingly important. Linguistics is important insofar as it contributes to the other components of the bilingual education preparation--cultural understanding, teaching methodology, and knowledge of the language of the target group. In the preparation of the bilingual educator, all these components must support and reinforce each other. Just as the collapse of one wall will lead to the collapse of an entire building, so the neglect or absence of one of the elements in the preparation of the bilingual educator may make the other elements useless. Teachers whose knowledge of linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics is *not* matched by a knowledge of culture and the pupil's dominant language and cultural background and by empathy with the community in which the pupil lives are not likely to make a very significant contribution to the goals of bilingual/cross-cultural education.

REFERENCES

Brown, Roger W. *A First Language--The Early Stages.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Center for Applied Linguistics. *Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of Bilingual-Bicultural Education.* Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. *Manual for Developing, Evaluating and Approving Professional Preparation Progress Plans for the Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Specialist Credential 1973-74.* Sacramento: State of California, 1973.

Dusek, Jerome B. "Do Teachers Bias Children's Learning?" *Review of Educational Research,* XLV, No. 4 (Fall, 1975), 661-684.

"Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages--An Exposition," *Modern Language Journal,* L, No. 6 (October, 1966). (Golden Anniversary issue.)

Hatch, Evelyn Marcussen. *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings.* Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, 1978.

Lum, John. *Pluralism and Potpourri: Asian Ain'ts,* Bilingual Education Paper Series, Vol. I, No. 3. Los Angeles: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, October, 1977.

Merino, Bárbara J. *Report on the Working Conference on the SCRDT Teacher Tests for Spanish/English Bilingual Education (February 12-13, 1976).* Occasional Paper No. 14. Stanford: Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1976.

_____, and Robert L. Politzer. *Toward Validation of Tests for Teachers in Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program.* Memorandum No. 151. Stanford: Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1977.

Ramírez, Arnulfo. *Teaching Reading in Spanish: A Study of Teacher Effectiveness.* Stanford: School of Education, Stanford University, 1978.

_____, and Robert L. Politzer. *Language Attitudes and the Achievement of Bilingual Pupils.* Memorandum No. 146. Stanford: Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1976.

_____, and Nelly P. Stromquist. *ESL Methodology and Student Learning in Bilingual Elementary Schools.* Stanford: School of Education, Stanford University, 1978.

Richards, Jack C. *Error Analysis. Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition.* London: Longman, 1974.

Strevens, Peter. *New Orientations in the Teaching of English.* London: Oxford University Press, 1977.